

Issued on October 7, 2020.

**Lance T. Gant,**

*Director, Compliance & Airworthiness  
Division, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 2020-23166 Filed 10-19-20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 117

[Docket No. USCG-2020-0573]

RIN 1625-AA09

#### Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Little Manatee River, Ruskin, Hillsborough County, FL

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard proposes to modify the operating schedule that governs the Seaboard Systems Railroad Bridge across the Little Manatee River, mile 2.4, at Ruskin, Hillsborough County, FL. This proposed rule would allow the swing bridge to be remotely operated and provide an opening when a three hour notice is given. The proposed rule would also change the name of the bridge to reflect current ownership.

**DATES:** Comments and relate material must reach the Coast Guard on or before December 21, 2020.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments identified by docket number USCG-2020-0573 using Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below for instructions on submitting comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions on this proposed rule, call or email LT Clark W. Sanford with the Coast Guard Sector St Petersburg Florida, Waterways Office; telephone 813-228-2191 x8105, email [Clark.W.Sanford@uscg.mil](mailto:Clark.W.Sanford@uscg.mil).

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **I. Table of Abbreviations**

CFR Code of Federal Regulations  
DHS Department of Homeland Security  
FR Federal Register  
OMB Office of Management and Budget  
NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking  
(Advance, Supplemental)

§ Section  
U.S.C. United States Code

## **II. Background, Purpose and Legal Basis**

CSX Transportation requested the Coast Guard consider allowing the Seaboard Systems Railroad Bridge 33 CFR 117.297, across the Little Manatee River to be remotely operated. The name of the bridge would be updated to reflect the current bridge owner and will be referred to as the CSX Railroad Bridge. The Seaboard System Railroad Bridge across the Little Manatee River, mile 2.4, at Ruskin, Hillsborough County, FL is a swing bridge. The bridge is currently maintained in the closed position with a three hour advance notice for an opening. It has a vertical clearance of 5 feet at mean high water in the closed position and a horizontal clearance of 35 feet.

## **III. Discussion of Proposed Rule**

The Coast Guard proposes to modify the operating schedule of the Seaboard System Railroad Bridge across Little Manatee River, mile 2.4, in Ruskin, Hillsborough County, FL. This proposed regulation would change the name of the bridge and allow the bridge to be remotely monitored and operated. This proposal will allow vessels to pass through the bridge while taking into account the reasonable needs of other modes of transportation.

## **IV. Regulatory Analyses**

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive Orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on these statutes and Executive Orders and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

### *A. Regulatory Planning and Review*

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits. Executive Order 13771 directs agencies to control regulatory costs through a budgeting process. This NPRM has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and pursuant to OMB guidance it is exempt from the requirements of Executive Order 13771.

This regulatory action determination is based on the ability that vessels can still transit the bridge given advanced notice. Vessels that can transit under the bridge without an opening may do so at any time.

### *B. Impact on Small Entities*

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601–612, as amended, requires federal agencies to consider the potential impact of regulations on small entities during rulemaking. The term “small entities” comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000. The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

While some owners or operators of vessels intending to transit the bridge may be small entities, for the reasons stated in section IV.A above this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on any vessel owner or operator.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.

Under section 213(a) of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–121), we want to assist small entities in understanding this proposed rule. If the rule would affect your small business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction and you have questions concerning its provisions or options for compliance, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. The Coast Guard will not retaliate against small entities that question or complain about this proposed rule or any policy or action of the Coast Guard.

### *C. Collection of Information*

This proposed rule would call for no new collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520.).

### *D. Federalism and Indian Tribal Government*

A rule has implications for federalism under Executive Order 13132, (Federalism), if it has a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. We have analyzed this proposed rule under that Order and have determined that it is consistent with the fundamental federalism principles and preemption requirements described in Executive Order 13132.

Also, this proposed rule does not have tribal implications under Executive Order 13175, (Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments), because it would not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes. If you believe this proposed rule has implications for federalism or Indian tribes, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

#### *E. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act*

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538) requires Federal agencies to assess the effects of their discretionary regulatory actions. In particular, the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a State, local, or tribal government, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100,000,000 (adjusted for inflation) or more in any one year. Though this proposed rule will not result in such an expenditure, we do discuss the effects of this proposed rule elsewhere in this preamble.

#### *F. Environment*

We have analyzed this proposed rule under Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023–01, Rev.1, associated implementing instructions, and Environmental Planning Policy COMDTINST 5090.1 (series), which guide the Coast Guard in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)(42 U.S.C. 4321–4370f). The Coast Guard has determined that this action is one of a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This proposed rule simply promulgates the operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. Normally such actions are categorically excluded from further review, under paragraph L49, of Chapter 3, Table 3–1 of the U.S. Coast Guard

Environmental Planning Implementation Procedures.

Neither a Record of Environmental Consideration nor a Memorandum for the Record are required for this rule. We seek any comments or information that may lead to the discovery of a significant environmental impact from this proposed rule.

#### *G. Protest Activities*

The Coast Guard respects the First Amendment rights of protesters. Protesters are asked to contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section to coordinate protest activities so that your message can be received without jeopardizing the safety or security of people, places or vessels.

#### **V. Public Participation and Request for Comments**

We view public participation as essential to effective rulemaking, and will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. Your comment can help shape the outcome of this rulemaking. If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this rulemaking, indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation.

We encourage you to submit comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. If your material cannot be submitted using <http://www.regulations.gov>, contact the person in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document for alternate instructions.

We accept anonymous comments. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov> and will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and submissions in response to this document, see DHS's eRulemaking System of Records notice (85 FR 14226, March 11, 2020).

Documents mentioned in this NPRM as being available in this docket and all public comments, will be in our online docket at <http://www.regulations.gov> and can be viewed by following that website's instructions. Additionally, if you go to the online docket and sign up for email alerts, you will be notified when comments are posted or a final rule is published.

#### **List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 117**

Bridges.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard proposes to amend 33 CFR part 117 as follows:

#### **PART 117—DRAWBRIDGE OPERATION REGULATIONS**

■ 1. The authority citation for part 117 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 499; 33 CFR 1.05–1; DHS Delegation No. 0170.1.

■ 2. Revise § 117.297 to read as follows:

##### **§ 117.297 Little Manatee River.**

The draw for the CSX Railroad Bridge, mile 2.4 near Ruskin FL, shall operate as follows:

(a) The bridge is normally maintained in the closed position.

(b) The bridge is not tendered locally, but will be monitored and operated by a remote bridge tender. The draw must open if at least three hours advance notice is requested via marine radio channel 9 VHF or telephone (813) 677–3974.

(c) Marine radio communication shall be maintained, by the remote bridge tender, with mariners near the bridge for the safety of navigation. Visual monitoring of the waterway shall be maintained with the use of cameras. Detection sensors shall be installed for the detection of vessels approaching the spans.

(d) The bridge shall not be operated from the remote location in the following events: Failure or obstruction of the detection sensors, cameras or marine radio communications. In these situations, a bridge tender must be on-site and locally operate the bridge.

Dated: October 7, 2020.

**Eric C. Jones,**

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 2020–22607 Filed 10–19–20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110–04–P**

#### **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

##### **Patent and Trademark Office**

##### **37 CFR Part 42**

[Docket No. PTO–C–2020–0055]

##### **Request for Comments on Discretion To Institute Trials Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board**

**AGENCY:** Patent Trial and Appeal Board, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office or USPTO)